ing up near the city of Jammu during the last three years;

(b) the number of authorised/unauthorised colonies, separately, and authorised colonies, separately and who are the promoters thereof;

(c) whether it is a fact that the land used by the colonisers also includes State/Forest Land;

(d) whether the above land also includes the area to which Town Planning Act/Development Act and Grants Act apply;

(e) what is the rate at which the colonisers are selling various types of plots; and

(f) whether Government have taken or proposed to take any effectiAve steps to check the growth of unauthorised or unplanned colonies?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT (SHRI ARUNACHALAM (a) to (f) Urban Development is a State subject and the responsibility in regard to giving permissions for colonies under the respective Town Planning Act or taking action against unauthorised colonies is that of the State Government and the local body or development authority concerned. Hence the Government of India is not collecting any data in this regard with reference to specific cities in any State.

Acquisition of Government Land by Ambedkar Bhavan, Rani Jhansi Road, New Delhi

3420. SHRI SATCHIDANANDA: Will the Minister URBAN DEVELOPMENT be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that Ambedkar Bhawan, Rani Jhansi Road, New Delhi has unauthorisedly acquired Government land;

(b) whether it is a fact that this land has been given to a private caterer by taking lakhs of rupees;

(c) whether this caterer is doing the business of catering on the premises of this building; and

(d) if so, the action taken by Government to take back the land which is in unauthorised possession of the Ambedkar Bhawan and to stop the catering business from the premises?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT) (SHRI M. ARUNACHALAM): (a) A plot of land measuring 1.45 acres in Rani Jhansi Road (known as Ambedkar Bhawan) was allotted to Delhi Scheduled Caste Welfare Association in July, 1946. The institution has unauthorisedly occupied an area of around 3500 sq. Mtr. adjacent to this plot. The request of the institution for allotment of this is being examined.

(b) and (c) No, Sir.

(d) Does not arise in view of (b) and (c) above.

Acquisition of land for development of Delhi

3421. SHRI SHIVPRASAD CHANPURIA: Will the Minister of URBAN DEVELOPMENT be pleased to state

(a) whether the persons whose land of 1 bigha is acquired for planned development of Delhi are entitled to plot-size of 40 sq. yards under the scheme of large scale acquisition development and disposal of land, 1961, so, since when this decision is in vogue;

(b) whether the decision of plot-size of 40 Sq. yards in cases acquisition of land of 1 bigha applicable in cases prior to 1991, if so, what is the rationals for retrospective application of this decision; and

(c) whether the persons whose land of 1 bigha was acquired and were allotted plot-size measuring of 250 sq yards as par their original recommen

dation, can be given the plot of 40 sq. yards in its places, if so, what are the reasons therefor?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT (SHRI M. ARUNACHALAM): (a) and (b) As per clarification issued by the Delhi Admn. in November, 1990, persons whose lands measuring exactly one bigha were acquired and in respect of which awards were announced prior to 3-4-1986 are eligible for 40 sq. yards plot.

(c) Prior to 15-11-1990, in some cases by a wrong interpretation of the orders, Delhi Administration had recommended 250 sq. yards erroneously in case of land acquired measured one bigha. The correct position was clarified on 15-11-1990. In respect of cases where 250 sq. yards plots were wrongly recommended no final decision has been taken by the Delhi Administration.

Rohini Residential Scheme

3422. SHRI SHIV PRASAD CHANPURIA: Will the Minister of URBAN DEVELOPMENT be pleased to state:

(a) the number of changes for location of plots were made from Rohini Residential Scheme to other fully developed schemes of North Zone during January, 1989 to June, 1992;

(b) what are the grounds for which changes were allowed;

(c) the number of allottees still requesting for change from Rohini Residential Scheme to other developed colonies of North Zone;

(d) the requests of such allottees of Rithala Village in Rohini were considered but not acceded to; and

(e) what are the reasons for not allowing change of requests affected Rithala Villagers to other developed Schemes of North Zone?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT (SHRI M. ARUNACHALAM): (a) and (b) DDA have reported that in 14 cases changes were allowed during the period January 1989 to June 1992 for reasons such as:

(i) Plot allotted was a irregular size.

(ii) Plot allotted is not fully developed.

(iii) Existance of grave yard etc. at the site.

(c) In 9 cases allottees, are still requesting for change from Rohini residential scheme to other developed pockets of North Zone.

(d) and (e) Two cases of requests for change of allottees residing in Rithala Village from Rohini to other pockets of North Zone were not agreed to earlier. However, their subsequent requests for change are again under examination.

Construction of road in Mandawali Fazalpur, Delhi

3423. SHRI SHANTI TYAGI: Will the Minister of URBAN DEVELOPMENT be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that huge amount was spent to construct a 100 feet wide road from the Railway crossing to the Railway Colony, Mandawali Fazalpur, Delhi but only a stretch of 500 yards was constructed;

(b) if so, what measures have been taken to complete the road, during the last five years;

(c) whether it is a fact that there is no link road to connect the Railway Colony to any motorable road in its vicinity;

(d) whether it is also a fact that the drains in the colony remain blocked with filth and dirty water and fear of outbreak of epidemic looms large at all times but the colony is declared an urbanised regularised colony; and